

Serial No. 10/824,364  
Amdt. dated February 9, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of November 9, 2006

Docket No. K-0633

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 5, and 7-23 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 11, and 18 have been amended and claims 4 and 6 have been canceled.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 11-17, and 20-22 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) for being anticipated by the Murayama publication. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites “at least one supplement bulkhead coupled to at least one side portion other than an end portion of the bulkhead.” (Emphasis added). The Murayama publication does not disclose these features. As shown in Figure 10, the Murayama publication discloses a supplemental bulkhead 15 attached to an end of a main bulkhead 7. The Murayama publication, therefore, fails to disclose the features added by amendment to claim 1, and in fact teaches directly away from these features.

Because the Murayama publication does not disclose all the features of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Murayama does not anticipate this claim or any of its dependent claims.

Claims 7, 11, and 18 have been amended to recite features similar those added to claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted that these and their dependent claims are also allowable over Murayama.

Serial No. 10/824,364  
Amdt. dated February 9, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of November 9, 2006

Docket No. K-0633

Claim 20 recites an organic EL display panel comprising “a sealant formed in a region other than the emitting region,” and a supplemental bulkhead angled between the emitting cell and the sealant so as “to prevent a sealant from permeating into the emitting cell.” The Murayama publication does not disclose these features relating to the sealant. In the Office Action, the Examiner referenced Paragraph 17 of Murayama for these features, but it is not apparent from Paragraph 17 that these features are disclosed.

The Examiner is requested to provide an English translation of the Murayama patent, if the rejection of claim 20 is to be maintained. Without such a translation, it is respectfully submitted that the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of unpatentability of claim 20 cannot be established.

Claims 5, 7-10, 18, 19, and 23 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for being obvious in view of an APA-Murayama combination. Applicants traverse this rejection on grounds that APA does not teach or suggest the features of base claims 1, 7, 11, 18, and 20 missing from the Murayama publication.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Serial No. 10/824,364  
Amdt. dated February 9, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of November 9, 2006

Docket No. K-0633

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Daniel Y. J. Kim  
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros  
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3701  
**Date:** February 9, 2007

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**